

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NICO CRUZ SANCHEZ, individually and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated,)	Case No.: 1:20-cv-1510 JLT EPG
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE
)	SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE REGARDING
v.)	THE LITIGATION EXPENSES INCURRED BY
)	CLASS COUNSEL
MOHAWK INDUSTRIES, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Class Counsel report litigation costs in the amount of \$21,597.01 in this action. (Doc. 82-1 at 8.) Graham B. LippSmith reports that he identified “the costs Class Counsel incurred to date and that they anticipate incurring through final approval.” (Doc. 82-1 at 8, ¶ 20.) However, the Court will not award costs for *anticipated* costs, but rather actual litigation expenses that were incurred. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1920; Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 54; *see also Ontiveros v. Zamora*, 303 F.R.D. 356, 375 (E.D. Cal. 2014) (indicating that payments from the common fund for litigation expenses are intended to be a “reimbursement”). Nevertheless, Mr. LippSmith also indicates that “Class Counsel has a more detailed itemization of the costs that Class Counsel can make immediately available for the Court’s review.” (Doc. 82-1 at 8, ¶ 21.) Such information is necessary for the Court to determine whether the requested litigation expenses are fair, reasonable, and adequate in reviewing the requested payments from the Settlement fund.

1 Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**: Class Counsel **SHALL** file supplementary evidence
2 regarding their litigation expenses, including an itemization the costs incurred, **no later than**
3 **September 15, 2025**.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: **September 8, 2025**


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE